In the Matter Of:

FARID vs TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

23-cv-426-SM

AMRO FARID

January 10, 2025



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
3	
4	AMRO FARID,
5	Plaintiff,
6	v. C.A. 23-cv-426-SM
7	
8	TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,
9	Defendant.
10	
11	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
12	
13	VIDEO DEPOSITION OF
14	AMRO FARID
15	
16	January 10, 2025
17	9:10 a.m.
18	
19	111 Amherst Street
20	Manchester, New Hampshire
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Sharon Saalfield, CSR, RDR, CRR



1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
2	
3	On Behalf of the Plaintiff, Amro Farid:
4	JOSEPH SULMAN, ESQ. LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH SULMAN
5	255 Bear Hill Road Waltham, Massachusetts 02451
6	617.521.8600 jsulman@sulmanlaw.com
7	On Behalf of the Defendant, Trustees of Dartmouth
8	College:
9	PIERRE A. CHABOT, ESQ. STEPHEN ZAHARIAS, ESQ.
10	DEVINE MILLIMET & BRANCH 111 Amherst Street
11	Manchester, New Hampshire 03101 603.669.1000
12	pchabot@devinemillimet.com szaharias@devinemillimet.com
13	DZanariabeaevinemiriimee.eom
14	Videographer: Alex Jandrow
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1		INDEX	
2			PAGE
3	AMRO FARID		
4	By Mr. Chabot		8
5		INDEX TO EXHIBITS	
6	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
7	Exhibit 1	Plaintiff's Answers to Defendant'	s
8		First Set of Interrogatories	11
9	Exhibit 2	Complaint	13
10	Exhibit 3	12/14/21 Letter	29
11	Exhibit 4	Thayer School of Engineering	
12		Faculty Roster 2020/2021	39
13	Exhibit 5	5/19/20 Email Chain	46
14	Exhibit 6	2/22/16 Email with Attachment	89
15	Exhibit 7	12/12/24 Memorandum	94
16	Exhibit 8	8/11/23 Letter	96
17	Exhibit 9	Dartmouth College Intellectual	
18		Property Agreement	97
19	Exhibit 10	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	
20		Provisional Patent Application	100
21	Exhibit 11	Plaintiff's Supplemental Answers	
22		to Defendant's First Set of	
23		Interrogatories	108
24	Exhibit 12	6/10/21 Note Regarding Video Call	
25		on 6/10/21	129



		OILLO O	- DARTINGO THE GOLLLOC	
1		IN	DEX TO EXHIBITS (Cont'd)	
2				
3	NUMBER		DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	Exhibit 1	13	6/17/21 Note Regarding Video Call	
5			on 6/17/21	133
6	Exhibit 1	14	7/09/21 Note Regarding In-Office	
7			Visit on 7/09/21	136
8	Exhibit 1	15	6/24/21 Note Regarding Video Call	
9			on 6/24/21	142
10	Exhibit 1	16	10/01/21 Note Regarding Video Call	-
11			on 10/01/21	144
12	Exhibit 1	17	11/30/21 Note Regarding Video Call	-
13			on 11/30/21	147
14	Exhibit 1	18	1/06/22 Note Regarding Video Call	
15			on 1/06/22	148
16	Exhibit 1	19	4/13/22 Note Regarding In-Office	
17			Visit on 4/13/22	151
18	Exhibit 2	20	Undated Letter To Whom It May	
19			Concern from Erin Storm	158
20	Exhibit 2	21	8/06/15 Letter	163
21	Exhibit 2	22	11/19/18 Letter	166
22	Exhibit 2	23	5/19/20 Email Chain	175
23	Exhibit 2	24	Document Entitled "Extenuating	
24			Circumstances"	202
25	Exhibit 2	25	10/19/20 Letter	202



1		INDEX TO EXHIBITS (Cont'd)	
2	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
3	Exhibit 2	6 Amro M. Farid Curriculum Vitae	
4		and Faculty Personal Record	211
5	Exhibit 2	7 "A Tensor-Based Formulation of	
6		Hetero-functional Graph Theory"	216
7	Exhibit 2	8 "The Hetero-functional Graph	
8		Theory Toolbox"	222
9	Exhibit 2	9 8/10/22 Email	228
10	Exhibit 3	0 8/10/22 Email	228
11	Exhibit 3	1 8/10/22 Email	228
12	Exhibit 3	2 6/02/20 Email Chain	233
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	i .		



Т	DEPOSITION OF AMRO FARID
2	January 10, 2025
3	
4	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now going on the
5	record. This is the video-recorded deposition of
6	Amro Farid being taken in the matter of Farid versus
7	Trustees of Dartmouth College. This deposition is
8	being held at 111 Amherst Street, Manchester, New
9	Hampshire, on January 10th, 2025. The time is 9:10
LO	a.m. My name is Alex Jandrow. I'm the videographer.
L1	And the court reporter is Sharon Saalfield.
L2	Counsel will introduce themselves for the
L3	record and the witness will be sworn.
L4	MR. SULMAN: This is Joseph Sulman, counsel
L5	for the deponent, Amro Farid.
L6	MR. CHABOT: And this is Pierre Chabot of
L7	Devine Millimet & Branch Professional Association. I
L8	represent Trustees of Dartmouth College. Stephen
L9	Zaharias, also counsel of record from this firm, is
20	joining me here today.
21	And before you swear the witness, I just
22	want to confirm, Joe, the usual stipulations.
23	Sometimes there's a misunderstanding about this so I
24	just want to make sure that we have the same
25	understanding, which is that notarization and



signature of the transcript are waived. Any errata to the transcript, however, have to be made by the deponent within 30 days of the date that the court reporter delivers the transcript by email to counsel for the plaintiff. Errata should be notarized and signed. Any extensions to any of these deadlines must be in writing and agreed upon by both parties. Email is a sufficient writing. If no errata are served within 30 days or such longer time as counsel may agree, the transcript will be considered to be correct as transcribed and can be used for all purposes it can lawfully be used under New Hampshire law.

Objections, except those concerning the form of questions or those asserting a lawful privilege, are reserved until the time of the trial in this matter. And then counsel does not need to articulate the specific form objection being asserted, except on request of the examining attorney.

Is that acceptable?

MR. SULMAN: Yes, except that I'm not -I'm not familiar with the requirement to notarize an
errata sheet. I've never done that before.

MR. CHABOT: Okay.



1	MR. SULMAN: So that's not my practice.
2	MR. CHABOT: Okay. I am if you will say
3	on the record that any errata sheet that you deliver
4	to me may be treated as it is as if it is given
5	under oath, then I can live without a notarization.
6	MR. SULMAN: Yes, it'll be treated as if
7	under oath.
8	MR. CHABOT: Okay. Thank you.
9	THE REPORTER: And may I clarify? Part of
10	what you said is that reading and signing will be
11	waived, but then you spoke about
12	MR. CHABOT: Of the transcript. Reading
13	and signing of the transcript. The errata sheet is a
14	different matter.
15	THE REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.
16	AMRO FARID,
17	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
18	EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. CHABOT:
20	Q. And good morning, Dr. Farid.
21	A. Good morning.
22	Q. Before we get started, I just want to make
23	sure that if there's anything happening with you
24	today that would prevent you or impair you from
25	hearing, processing, or responding to my questions,



would you tell us about that now?

- A. There's nothing at the moment.
- Q. Okay. Can you just walk us through your educational background, starting with high school, and just walk us through, where did you go to high school? Where did you go to college? What degrees do you have?
- A. I'm from Mansfield, Connecticut. I went to -- I went to Edwin O. Smith High School in Storrs, Connecticut. I graduated amongst the very top of my class. I went to MIT for my undergraduate training. There I graduated with a degree in -- a Bachelor of Science degree in mechanical engineering. I also had minors in economics, political science, and music.

After that I continued at MIT in the mechanical engineering department for a Master of Science degree. At that point in time, I wanted to study abroad, so I went and studied in Spain, in Madrid, at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, and --

- Q. Would you be able to spell that for the court reporter?
- A. Oh, Universidad is spelled

 U-N-I-V-E-R-S-I-D-A-D. Complutense is spelled

 C-O-M-P-L-U-T-E-N-S-E. De, is D-E. And then Madrid.

 Madrid.



1 \mid around 2016" is relevant to the tenure der	ial
---	-----

- Q. Okay. Taking the last of those first, you note here that Joseph Helble, who was at the time the dean of the Thayer School; that is correct?
 - A. He was the dean of engineering, yes.
- Q. Okay. You say around 2016, he discouraged you from participating in Al-Nur, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. He didn't prevent you from participating in 10 Al-Nur, did he?
- 11 MR. SULMAN: Objection.
- 12 You can answer.
- THE WITNESS: Can you restate the question?
- 14 BY MR. CHABOT:

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

- Q. He didn't prevent you from participating in Al-Nur, did he?
- A. He gave as clear of a discouragement as possible.
 - Q. And what was that discouragement? What were the -- what did he tell you?
 - A. He told me that he wouldn't want it to distract me from my tenure case.
- Q. Did he tell you anything else at the time?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. What did he tell you?



A. Well, the meeting was an impromptu meeting
after hours. I was in my office at the Thayer School
of Engineering in the Cummings building, and I had ${\rm my}$
door open. It was after 5:00. And he just sort of
showed up. And unannounced. There wasn't a
scheduled meeting of any kind. And, you know, came
by to see me, and I welcomed him into my office,
and the conversation was a long time ago. The
but the entirety of the conversation was around the
Al-Nur Muslim Student Association on campus, and the
situation of Muslim students on campus, and my my
involvement with them, the involvement of my wife,
Professor Inas Khayal, as well, and the need for a
Muslim chaplain, if you will, a Muslim student
advisor for this student group as is commonplace at
all of the other Ivy League universities.

Shall I continue?

Joe Helble. When he had this conversation, he told you that you could participate more fully in Al-Nur after you went up for tenure, didn't he?

- A. He did say that, but that is different than what he does for other faculty and other student groups.
 - Q. What is the basis for you saying so?
 - A. For example, Doug Van Citters, who was an



- assistant professor at the time, had not yet gotten tenure, was active with the Dartmouth crew or rowing team, and was very much encouraged to be involved in their activities. And, in general, there was an environment at Dartmouth and Thayer for faculty to be involved, encouraging an active, vibrant student life, and I felt I was doing that as a member of the faculty.
- Q. When was it you say that Doug Van Citters was encouraged to be involved with crew or rowing? What time frame?
- A. As far as I know, the duration of his assistant professorship. I had had a number of different conversations with him about his involvement in crew because I'm also a former rower.
- Q. Professor Farid, were you aware -- going back to your interrogatory answer in that paragraph about the tenure denial. And we'll get back to the denial of energy system paragraph in a minute. But I want to focus on the tenure denial paragraph on page 2.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You say that that decision or that denial involved at least Alexis Abramson, Laura Ray, Lee Lynd, the Thayer tenured faculty, Joseph Helble, CAP,



1	that's the committee advisory to the president?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. Philip Hanlon, who was the president of
4	Dartmouth College at the time?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And possibly more individuals, right?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. Okay. I want to take each of those one at
9	a time.
LO	With respect to Alexis Abramson, did she ever
L1	make any inappropriate comment to you concerning your
L2	national origin or religion?
L3	A. No.
L4	Q. Have you become aware in the course of this
L5	case what her recommendation was to the Committee
L6	Advisory to the President with respect to your tenure
L7	application?
L8	A. No.
L9	Q. You haven't reviewed the discovery
20	materials that we've produced in that regard?
21	A. Not yet.
22	Q. Okay. How about Laura Ray? Has Laura Ray
23	ever made an inappropriate comment to you concerning
24	your religion or national origin?



No.

Α.

- Q. How about Professor Lynd, Lee Lynd? Has he ever made an inappropriate comment to you respecting your national origin or religion?
 - A. No.

- Q. We'll cover the tenured faculty. I have a list that we'll go over later, but I'll skip over to Joseph Helble. Did he ever make an inappropriate comment to you concerning your national origin or your religion?
- A. I consider what we were just talking about as in discouraging me from participating in the only faith group that is within 100 miles as inappropriate.
 - Q. Anything else?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. I just -- forgive me. Lawyers have to do this sometimes. So to reiterate, Joseph Helble didn't make any inappropriate comments to you concerning your national origin or religion except when he discouraged you from participating in the Al-Nur student group in approximately 2016; is that -- did I characterize your testimony fairly?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Thank you. Do you know who was sitting on the Committee Advisory to the President at the time



you applied for tenur		you	applied	for	tenure
-----------------------	--	-----	---------	-----	--------

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. To your knowledge, did anybody who served on the Committee Advisory to the President make any inappropriate comments to you concerning your national origin or religion?
 - A. I don't know who they are.
- Q. Okay. How about President Hanlon? Did

 President Hanlon ever make any appropriate -- sorry,

 strike that.

Did President Hanlon ever make any inappropriate comments to you with respect to your national origin or religion?

- A. No.
- Q. Are you aware of President Hanlon making any inappropriate comments about -- let's start with individuals who practice the Muslim faith. Are you aware of him ever making any inappropriate comment with Muslims?
 - A. No.
- Q. How about persons of Middle Eastern national origin?
- A. No.
- Q. And, again, that was, to just to be clear, you're not aware of President Hanlon making any



1	inappropriate comments about persons of Middle
2	Eastern national origin, correct?
3	A. I'm not aware of any such statements.
4	Q. Okay. Did you highlight paragraph 14 in
5	the federal complaint? I'm sorry, strike that. I
6	was thinking of paragraph 16.
7	Did you highlight paragraph 16 in the federal
8	complaint?
9	A. Yes, I did.

- Q. Okay. Is the statement not a single tenured colleague in the engineering school sought to collaborate with you on a research project or paper despite your invitations to do so, is that a statement that you can adopt under oath here today?
 - A. Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And then looking at paragraph 16, I just want to understand, and I want to make sure that the jury can understand. You considered the Thayer School of Engineering to be a prestigious institution, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Thank you.
- You don't know who, on the faculty, voted for or against your tenure application, do you?
 - A. No, I don't.



1		Q.	Do	you	 did	you	ever	become	aware	of	the
2	vote	tally	y ?								

Α. No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

- So you were not aware, as you sit here today, whether the vote was overwhelmingly negative or overwhelmingly positive?
- I have no idea what the result was other Α. than binary yes or no.
- Okay. Are you aware that Joe Helble did not vote on your tenure case?
- 11 I --Α.
- 12 Strike that. Are you aware whether Joe 0. 13 Helble voted on your tenure case?
- 14 I am not aware because I'm not supposed to 15 know.
 - You were at the meeting where they 0. deliberated on your tenure case before you were dismissed, were you not?
 - I was at the meeting, at the faculty I was at the faculty meeting where -- I was at the faculty meeting before the tenure review of myself and maybe another promotion was discussed.
- 23 Was Mr. Helble in attendance? Ο.
- 24 Α. No.
- 25 Q. The Al-Nur issue back in 2016, did



1	should continue to proceed with my research,
2	teaching, and service.
3	MR. CHABOT: I'm going to mark what we'll
4	call Exhibit 4 here.
5	(Exhibit 4 marked for identification.)
6	BY MR. CHABOT:
7	Q. I'm just going to first ask, Dr. Farid,
8	whether you recognize this document?
9	A. No. This is the first time I see this
10	document.
11	Q. Okay. I will represent to you that this
12	was the faculty roster for the academic year where
13	your tenure vote where your tenure application was
14	considered.
15	The year that you applied for tenure, only
16	tenured faculty members were permitted to vote on
17	your application, correct? Strike that.
18	Only full professors were permitted to vote on
19	your tenure application; is that correct?
20	A. That's false.
21	Q. Okay. With respect to your tenure
22	application, was it full professors and tenured
23	associate professors who voted?
24	A. During that year, Dean Abramson had
25	initiated a process to change the policies and

- procedures in the faculty handbook, including promotion and tenure, and one of the things that was discussed, and she initiated, was to have -- was to have associate professors with tenure vote on associate professors without tenure as a new change while my tenure review was actually still going on.
- Q. Did the other associate professors, the tenured associate professors, vote on your application, to your knowledge?
- A. I wasn't in the room, and so I can't say for certain. And I have not looked at the -- the evidence produced in discovery whether it has been or has not, but what I can say is that in that -- it was discussed. The point of having associate professors with tenure voting for the year that I was up for tenure, that was discussed several times, and, in the end, people supported that idea.
- Q. Can you take your blue highlighter there -I see that you have it near at hand already -- and I
 would like you to highlight the name of any professor
 or associate professor whoever said anything
 inappropriate to you concerning your national origin
 or religion. Again, just those first two that -professors and associate professors. You don't need
 to worry about assistant professors or the research

1	and instruction line.
2	I'm sorry, Dr. Farid, are you finished or are
3	you thinking?
4	A. I'm recalling.
5	Q. Okay. That's fine.
6	MR. SULMAN: Take your time.
7	BY MR. CHABOT:
8	Q. Are you all set?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Can you just for the record, so I don't
11	have to reach over and grab your exhibit, can you
12	tell me which names you highlighted?
13	A. Professor Eugene Santos.
14	Q. Can you please recount for me every
15	inappropriate comment Professor Santos ever made to
16	you about your national origin or your religion?
17	A. Well, this was approximately 2018.
18	Professor Santos and I shared McLane room 232 as a
19	shared laboratory facility, so the LIINES, the
20	laboratory for intelligent integrated networks of
21	engineering systems that I lead, had the middle
22	section of that shared space, and Professor Santos's
23	laboratory was just to the left, if you have your
24	back to the windows.

I was -- I was in the lab, and I was -- I



thought I'd reach out to Professor Santos, who had
come in, and invite him to collaborate. We had a
conversation about the possibilities of doing
research around systems engineering and systems
science. And and he told me that he much of
the work that much of the many of the projects
that he does require American citizenship, and so he
didn't think I was going to be eligible for
collaborating with him.

Now, this is strange, of course, because I am an American citizen. I was born in Brooklyn, New York. I've always been an American citizen. And so I questioned -- I questioned him on that. I said, you know, "Gene, you know I'm American, right?" And he's like, "No, I thought you were Emirati." And I have -- you know, the only way I can imagine that he came to the conclusion that I was Emirati is because I had worked in the United Arab Emirates four years earlier, but now it's 2018, three years on to the faculty, and I'm working right beside you. It struck me as odd.

- Q. Is that the extent of any inappropriate comment that Professor Santos made about your national origin or religion?
 - A. I have related the event.



- Q. Okay. And there's no other events to relate, correct?
 - A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And then, two years later, you asked to have Professor Santos serve on your tenure review committee, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. At some point prior to your reappointment in 2018, somebody at the Thayer School made it clear to you that it seemed likely you were going to need to use all six years available to you in order to build a successful tenure case; is that correct?
 - A. Could you say that again?
- Q. Sure. One of your allegations in that interrogatory response number 3 involves Dr. Helble telling you that -- orally telling you that you could have, you know, potentially a four-year tenure track, and you seem to take issue with the fact that he didn't honor that. Am I -- is that fair? You can look at Exhibit 1 if you like, the interrogatory responses.
 - A. This is 3. This is 4.
 - Q. Thank you for keeping good order there.
- A. So you're referring me to Exhibit 1, and which paragraph?



- 1 A. With -- around the first two weeks of 2 September '21.
 - Q. Okay. And at that time, what was -- you asked to transfer those funds to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, correct?
 - A. False.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Okay. Where did you ask to transfer those funds in the fall of 2021?
- A. I was not asking for -- to transfer at all.

 I was asking to subcontract.
- Q. Okay. I will go ahead and assume that there is an important difference, and I will just adopt your nomenclature. You asked to subcontract the funds --
- A. There's a -- there's a -- there's a tremendous difference between the two, and it's imperative that the -- that both counsels and the jury understand the difference.
- Q. What does Roman numeral 2 say? Can you read those words again?
- A. Denial of transfer/subcontract of CRREL funding.
 - Q. It uses both terms there, does it not?
- 24 A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. Okay. And you say the denial of transfer



- and subcontract of CRREL funding occurred in the fall of 2021 in your answer, right?
 - A. That could have been written more accurately or more correctly. The denial of the subcontract of CRREL funding occurred in fall 2021. The transfer would -- the request for transfer would not occur until August of 2022.
 - Q. Okay. So with respect to the request to subcontract the CRREL funding --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- in approximately September 2021 --
- 12 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- that request was to, I guess, issue a subcontract so that you could use the funding at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Is that a better characterization?
 - A. Well, I would not -- I would not have the ability to use the funding myself because I'm not a principal investigator at MIT, but I would be able to carry out the work using the human resources available at MIT through the subcontract.
 - Q. When were you first appointed as a visiting professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?
 - A. Sometime in the fall of 2021. I've had



- appointments at MIT since fall of 2010.
- Q. Okay. So if I told you that your appointment as a visiting professor at MIT was approximately November 29th or 30th, 2021, would that be in the realm of reason?
 - A. Somewhere in there. I don't have the exact start date.
 - Q. It was certainly after you made the request for the subcontract of CRREL funding to MIT, right?
 - A. The subcontract -- when I am asking for a subcontract, I am asking in my capacity as a Dartmouth professor, and not as a visiting professor at MIT. It's actually entirely irrelevant that I would be a professor -- visiting professor at MIT because I -- because visiting professors are not principal investigators. So I'm -- it's not like I'm transferring it to myself or -- sorry, subcontracting it to myself. That's not the case. It's being subcontracted to Professor Kamal Youcef-Toumi.
 - Q. And that is Y-O-U-C-E-F, dash?
 - A. Dash, T-O-U-M-I.
 - Q. Thank you. And Kamal is K-A-M-A-L?
- A. That's right.
- Q. You say here, the next line, that this denial of subcontract that occurred in fall 2021 that



- involved Elizabeth Wilson and David Coates. Do you see that?
 - A. That's right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

- Q. What is your understanding of Elizabeth Wilson's role in deciding not to subcontract funds?
- A. Well, perhaps most importantly, she's the one who relayed the information that the -- that the subcontract could not go -- could not go forward, so that's probably the most important role that she played.
- Q. Do you have any basis to say that Elizabeth Wilson harbored any animus against you on the basis of your national origin or your religion?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Now, the other person you described there is David Coates. What was your understanding of -- David Coates was the provost of Dartmouth at this time; is that right?
 - A. That's right.
 - O. What was -- what is -- strike that.
- 21 What is your understanding of Provost Coates'
 22 role -- Coates' role in the decision not to
 23 subcontract funds to MIT?
 - A. Well, when Professor Wilson relayed the decision that the subcontract would not -- would not



go forward, she referred to the provost's office
repeatedly, and so the provost at the time is, you
know, Professor Provost Coates, and so I can only
assume that it was his decision. She also
specifically mentioned Dean Madden, who is also in
the provost's office. I believe his title is vice
provost of research. And so both of them, as far as
I can tell from Professor Wilson's my meeting with
her, were the ones who ultimately made the decision.

- Q. You don't have any direct knowledge that Dr. Coates personally played any role in that decision, do you?
- A. As is customary in universities, people refer to the office taking an action rather than an individual taking an action, and so in this case, Professor Wilson said "The provost's office took this action," and then I asked multiple times who, and -- and she did mention once also Dean Madden.
 - Q. But she didn't mention David Coates?
 - A. No.
- Q. Thank you. Have you ever had any interaction with David Coates that would make you think that he harbored any animus against you on the basis of your national origin or religion?
 - A. No.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, by the way, Dean Madden, Dean is his first name, not his title.

- Ο. Thank you for the clarification. Madden is a professor, but he works in the provost's He is not an academic dean.
- But he is the vice provost of research as Α. well.
- You mention -- and this is now on page 3. 0. You say the only other professor for whom Dartmouth denied a transfer or subcontract concerning this grant was only a co-PI for a very small portion of the project.

Do you see that?

- Α. Yes.
- Is that talking about the CRREL grant, the Ο. Cold Research -- sorry. The Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory?
 - Α. Yes.
- Who, to your knowledge, requested a sub award -- I'm sorry a subcontract of any portion of the CRREL grant and received it? You mentioned somebody was denied the ability to subcontract some of those funds. Did anybody successfully subcontract any funds from this grant that you're aware of?
 - Α. I'm not aware of anyone -- excuse me. Ι



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- if I hadn't already spoken to her. And she told me that subcontracts at Thayer and Dartmouth are commonplace, and she was not aware of any reason why a subcontract would not be approved.
- You're answering a slightly different question than I'm asking, though. What I'm asking is are you aware of anybody who has successfully subcontracted funds from the same type of grant as the CRREL grant?
- My role at the Thayer School of Engineering does not afford me the privilege of knowing about other people's grants. It's not something I'm allowed to have information or access to.
- How about at Stevens Institute of Technology? Did you -- the Stevens Institute of Technology allow you access to that kind of information there?
 - Other people's grants? Α.
 - Q. Yeah.
 - Α. No.
- Now, a transfer, right? Because you did 0. request a transfer of these same funds to the Stevens Institute of Technology?
 - Yes. Α.
 - Q. I think you said that was -- forgive me --



1 Α. August 2022.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- -- August 2022. The same month you 0. announced your resignation from the Thayer School of Engineering, correct?
 - Α. Yes.
- Are you aware of anybody who has been Ο. permitted to transfer funds from the type of grant -the same type of grant as the CRREL grant?
- Α. The -- I find it difficult to answer the question because I'm not -- I don't understand what you mean by "the CRREL type of grant."
 - Q. Okay.
 - Α. Right?
- That's a fair -- that's a fair characterization. Now, you did say earlier that your role at Thayer and your role at Stevens Institute of Technology didn't allow you access to information about other people's grants, correct?
 - Α. That's correct. Myself and --
- 20 Q. Okay.
- 21 -- any other, you know, faculty like Α. 22 myself.
- 23 Would you characterize the CRREL grant as 24 one that was competitively awarded?
 - Α. Yes.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- What is the basis for that? Okay. Ο.
- There was a broad agency announcement with Α. a solicitation requesting proposals for funding.
- Okav. And that's -- that is the basis that you say that this was competitively awarded funding?
- All of the -- all of the research funding Α. where there is a solicitation and professors need to submit proposals to answer an open call, yes, I would call that competitive.
- You list -- back in Exhibit 1, was Okay. Ο. anybody other than -- at least to your knowledge, was this the same group, Elizabeth Wilson and David Coates, who was involved in denying your request to transfer the CRREL funds to the Stevens Institute of Technology?
- I made the request to transfer the CRREL funding in writing. I believe that in that email, Jodi Harrington and Jill Mortali were the recipients of the email, so -- so it was really being made to Jill Mortali. I made a similar request for my NSF funding. The NSF transfer went through successfully, but I never got a -- I never got a response, again, as far as I recall, I never got a response that said, "We will not be transferring it," and there was not an explanation from Jill Mortali's office of

1	sponsored	programs.
---	-----------	-----------

- Q. But you were able to transfer the NSF funding, correct?
 - A. That's right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

- Q. Was that the NSF EAGER grant that you still have open at the Stevens Institute of Technology?
 - A. It is the NSF EAGER SSDIM project that I had opened at Stevens Institute of Technology. It's now since closed.
 - Q. When did it close?
 - A. As far as I recall, September 2023.
- Q. Did you request the transfer of any other funding at the time, August 2022, when you announced your resignation from the Thayer School of Engineering?
 - A. Those are the only two federally funded projects that I had, and so I requested both.
 - Q. Have you ever had any personal interactions with Jill Mortali?
 - A. We've shared many emails.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 A. But I actually -- I don't believe I've met 23 her in person.
- Q. Do you have any basis to say that Jill
 Mortali harbors any animus against you because of



1	A. No.
2	Q. You began looking for employment at the
3	Stevens Institute of Technology strike that.
4	You applied for employment at the Stevens
5	Institute of Technology in March of 2022, correct?
6	A. Approximately that time, that's correct.
7	Q. And they did ultimately offer you a tenured
8	faculty position there, correct?
9	A. Verbally.
LO	Q. I mean, verbally just means with words, so
L1	I would agree
L2	A. Orally.
L3	Q. Okay. They gave you a written offer letter
L4	at some point in August of 2022, correct?
L5	A. It was either right at the end of July or
L6	right at the beginning of August.
L7	Q. Okay. July or August 2022 they put an
L8	offer in writing, and that offered contained salary
L9	terms, correct?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. And it outlined the benefits that would be
22	provided to you, correct?
23	A. Correct.
24	O. And it outlined your teaching obligations,



presumably?

did not -- because Dartmouth didn't transfer the 1 2 CRREL money? 3 Α. No. 4 What is your current annual salary 5 at the Stevens Institute of Technology? 6 I just got a -- I just got a raise. Α. I'm 7 not sure the exact figure. Somewhere around 8 \$190,000. 9 0. Is that a 12-month or a nine-month 10 position? 11 That is a nine-month position. Α. 12 Do you -- do you have any opportunities at 0. 13 Stevens to earn additional money during the three 14 months off? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Do you avail yourself of those 17 opportunities? 18 Α. Yes. 19 0. Approximately, how many weeks during those 20 additional three months do you work? 21 Α. I use them all. 22 Okay. Are you permitted to use all --0. 23 forgive me -- all 12 weeks, approximately, under the 24 terms of your agreement with Stevens?

Yeah, three months. 25 percent FTE.

Α.

1 | Full-time equivalent is FTE.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. So is that an additional -- you basically made your pro rata salary for all of those additional weeks that you work over the summer? Strike that.

I'm not sure it is even the -- are the three months off during the summer at Stevens Institute of Technology, is that how that works?

- A. I have the -- I have the option of securing additional salary during the summer or the remaining 25 percent of my salary either directly through Stevens or indirectly.
 - Q. Okay. And, again --
- A. Or -- sorry. Directly through Stevens or directly to my person.
- Q. Okay. You own a limited liability company, correct? You're the -- you're at least a -- one owner --
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. -- of the membership shares in Engineering Systems Analytics, LLC?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And you've held yourself out in the public as the chief executive officer of Engineering Systems Analytics?
 - A. That's correct.



1	Q. Okay. Dr. Farid, at one point when the
2	research misconduct investigation committee was
3	requesting a live interview with you, you provided a
4	note that said you weren't able to participate.
5	Do you remember that?
6	A. I do. The note was from Erin Storm.
7	MR. SULMAN: Wait for a question.
8	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
9	MR. CHABOT: This will be Exhibit 20.
10	(Exhibit 20 marked for identification.)
11	BY MR. CHABOT:
12	Q. Is that the note from Erin Storm that you
13	just referenced?
14	A. Yes. It's a note from Erin Storm who was
15	acting as my medical practitioner at the time.
16	Q. Okay. What were the medical conditions
17	that impaired your ability to adequately and
18	authentically participate in the interview that was
19	requested?
20	MR. SULMAN: Objection.
21	You can answer.
22	THE WITNESS: I met with Erin Storm and I
23	elaborated the how Dartmouth had been mistreating
24	me through a tenure denial, a research misconduct

inquiry, the research misconduct investigation, and



4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- to ask him for his input concerning your progress
 towards tenure.
 - A. I had done that -- I had done that prior to this email already.
 - Q. Okay. And what was his feedback at that time?
 - A. I generally got the sense that I was doing fine, except for ENGS 22 as the hang-up.
 - Q. Professor Lynd did tell you that that could be a hang-up?
 - A. He didn't use that word.
 - Q. I'm paraphrasing using your terminology.
 - A. Yeah, yeah. He told me that the student evaluations of ENGS 22 would certainly be looked at -- would be looked at negatively, but if you show, you know, improvement in the student evaluations, then it should be okay. And that's what I did show.
 - O. Again, until fall of 2020, correct?
 - A. In the middle of COVID with a brand-new teaching format, yes.
 - Q. You requested to have Gene Santos and John Zhang serve as sort of your two-person tenure review committee, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. And that request was honored,



	TAKID VS TRUSTEES OF DARTINOUTH GOLLEGE
1	correct?
2	A. Yes. Are we moving on from Exhibit 23?
3	Q. We are moving on from Exhibit 23.
4	A. Okay, thank you.
5	MR. SULMAN: Do you have the time check?
6	VIDEOGRAPHER: Five hours, 54 minutes.
7	MR. CHABOT: Thank you. Mark Exhibit 24.
8	(Exhibit 24 marked for identification.)
9	BY MR. CHABOT:
LO	Q. I want to ask whether you recognize the
L1	document first, Professor Farid.
L2	A. This this document, I'm guessing, is
L3	being taken out of out of the context of an email
L4	that I had sent to Dean Abramson. Like, there's no
L5	mark that, you know, I wrote this. I believe I wrote
L6	this. I haven't seen this document in a long time.
L7	But it's being taken out of context of a much larger
L8	email.
L9	MR. CHABOT: I'll mark Exhibit 25. You may
20	want to look at these together.
21	(Exhibit 25 marked for identification.)
22	BY MR. CHABOT:

24

25

You can take whatever time you need to read this, Professor Farid, but I just direct your attention to paragraph 9 on the second page. See if



AMRO FARID	January 1
FARID vs TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE	·

1	and retaliation.
2	BY MR. CHABOT:
3	Q. Again, without asking for or trying to
4	locate the version of the arts and sciences handbook
5	or the Thayer handbook that was in force in 2016 when
6	you say that Dean Helble told you that you couldn't
7	get parental leave because Professor Khayal was also
8	taking it?
9	A. I tried to access the arts and sciences and
10	the Thayer faculty handbook, and those were what
11	were, you know, publicly available through, like, a
12	Google search.
13	Q. Didn't ask anybody for older copies?
14	A. I wasn't aware of changes being made.
15	Q. So you didn't ask for any older copies?
16	A. I did not ask for copies of something that
17	I'm not aware of.
18	MR. CHABOT: We'll mark Exhibit 26.

(Exhibit 26 marked for identification.)

THE WITNESS: All right.

BY MR. CHABOT:

19

20

21

22

23

24

- I assume that you're fairly conversant with your curriculum vitae and your faculty personal record, right?
- Α. Yes.



Q. This March 28th, 2021, version, do you have any reason to dispute that this was the version that you submitted to the tenured faculty to consider along with your tenure application? I can ask a better question.

Did you submit this version of your curriculum vitae and faculty personal record to the tenured faculty at the Thayer School of Engineering as part of your tenure application?

MR. SULMAN: If you need to look it over, look it over.

THE WITNESS: So I'm looking at the date.

I know that this date is automatically generated. So it would reflect -- before I even look at its contents, right, it would -- it would reflect that I write my CV in something called "lay tech," so it means that this document was turned into a PDF format in -- on March -- March 28th, 2021.

Now --

BY MR. CHABOT:

- Q. The faculty deliberation on your tenure vote, that was April 7th, 2021, correct?
- A. I don't believe I've answered your prior question, sir.
 - Q. Okay. What I'm trying to ask is whether --



do you know or not, one way or the other --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- whether this is the version of your curriculum vitae that was used and relied upon by the Thayer School of Engineering's faculty in considering your tenure application?

MR. SULMAN: Objection.

8 You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm trying to answer your question. I have to go back through my email records and see when it was that I sent materials to the tenure review committee. We just spoke -- we just spoke, in Exhibit 25, about me sending this document on October 19th, 2020, and it says, in my last correspondence to you on October 5th, 2020, I sent you my faculty personal record, which is this document on October 5th form -- October 4th -- sorry, October 5th, 2020.

I know, from recollection, that I did send an updated version, and at least once, maybe twice. I don't recall. I know for sure once. And I don't know what is the date of that submission. It strikes me as rather close to when the faculty vote was, March 28th, 2021.

BY MR. CHABOT:



- 1 Is it important to you to make sure that 0. 2 your curriculum vitae was thorough and accurate?
 - Α. I -- I did the very best I could to make it as accurate as possible.
 - Okay. And you knew, at least with the versions that you submitted to the tenured faculty, that they would be relying upon that curriculum vitae in considering your tenure application, correct?
 - Α. That's correct.
 - I'd like to take a look at page 19 very 0. And I just want to look at item number 5. quickly. Do you see item number 5?
 - Α. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 0. And that refers to a paper called a tensor-based formulation of the heterofunctional -of heterofunctional graph theory, correct?
 - Α. Correct.
- And it notes that -- so this is in the Ο. section journal papers under review, correct? this is something that you have submitted?
 - Α. Yes.
- And in that submission, Prabhat Hegde is included as the third author, correct? included as the third author in that submission?
 - Α. No, he was not.

